

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,415	09/28/2001 590 04/25/2002	Bert Leo Alfons Verdonck	NL000522	4364
Corporate Patent Counsel U.S. Philips Corporation 580 White Plains Road			EXAMINER CHURCH, CRAIG E	
Tarrytown, NY 10591			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	
			DATE MAILED: 04/25/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	s on the cover sheet	beneath the correspondence address –
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	O EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a ref NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defaulting to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated any reply received by the Office later than three months after the matern adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	reply within the statutory r lt, expire SIX (6) MONTHS atute, cause the application	minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. If from the mailing date of this communication. In to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
☐ This action is FINAL.		
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 193:	t for formal matters, p 5 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 2	rosecution as to the merits is closed in 13.
Disposition of Claims		
Ø Claim(s) 1 − 9	is/are pending in the application.	
Of the above claim(s)		
☐ Claim(s)		
⊠ Claim(s)	is/are rejected.	
□ Claim(s)	is/are objected to.	
□ Claim(s)		are subject to restriction or election
Application Papers		requirement
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are object	cted to by the Examin	er
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)		
▲ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority to the priority of the priori	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)–(d).
☑ All □ Some* □ None of the:		
Certified copies of the priority documents have been r		
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been r	•	
☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document		
in this national stage application from the Internationa *Certified copies not received:	• •	\
Attachment(s)	1	
☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTQ-1449, Paper No.	Interview Summary, PTO-413	
☑ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 √	Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94	Other	
Office A	ction Summary	

Serial No. Art Unit 966,415 2882

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The meaning of "projection line" is unclear.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chiu (5369678). Chiu teaches acquiring a sequence of images and adjusting imaging parameters such as collimator location based on artery position in the previous image.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention

-3-

Serial No.
Art Unit

966,415 2882

were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Toker (5365562). Toker teaches the common practice of acquiring a preview or scout image and then adjusting imaging parameters of subsequent images on in response to information from the scout image. The type of organ imaged and whether the images are frontal or lateral are not patentably germane.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Church at telephone number (703) 308-4861.

Crowg E Church

CRAIG E. CHURCH
Senior Examiner
ART UNIT 2882